

III. REMARKS

Applicant has considered the current Office Action of mailing date May 15, 2007. Claims 1-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 7, 14 and 15 have been amended. Applicant is not conceding in this application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Office. The present claim amendments are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application.

In the Office Action, claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 USC §112, ¶1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1 – 15 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b), as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Hennum et al. (US Patent No.: 6,259,445), hereafter “Hennum”.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of these original claims and other claims in one or more subsequent patent application that claim(s) priority to the instant application. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A. Rejection of Claims 1 – 15 Under 35 USC §112, ¶1

With respect to the Office’s rejection of the claim feature, “within a single screen a group of windows comprising”, claim 1, as constituting new matter, Applicant submit that claims 1, 7, 14 and 15 have been amended. Currently amended independent claims 1 and 7 recite, *inter alia*, “a display interface ... simultaneously displays a list of tutorial steps ...a code window ...an explanation window ... wherein each of the list of tutorial steps, the code window and the explanation window are integrated as separate segments within a single window....”. Currently

amended claims 14 and 15 are similarly amended to recite, *inter alia*, “the display interface simultaneously displays the results, the list of tutorial steps ... the code window, and the explanation window, wherein each of the list of tutorial steps, the code window, the explanation window and the results window are integrated as separate segments within the single window....”. Support for this amendment is found in the specification as originally filed in the application. Specifically, the display interface, as set out on page 8, line 22 – 30, “...comprises a code window 510, an explanation window 530, a list of the tutorial steps 500 contained within the tutorial application... and a results window 520.” From the illustration in the originally filed FIG. 5, the components: code window 510, explanation window 530, thread management 505 and results window 520” are depicted as separate segments within a window on a screen. Therefore, Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to currently amended independent claims 1, 7, 14 and 15. Consequently no new matter has been added to all other claims dependent from independent claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw this rejection.

B. Rejection of Claims 1 – 15 Under 35 USC §102(b) And §103(a)

With respect to the Office’s rejection of the claims based on Hennum under 35 USC §102(b), Applicant respectfully submits that Hennum does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. For example, Applicant submits that Hennum does not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, “[a] display interface ... wherein each of the list of tutorial steps, the code window and the explanation window are integrated as separate segments within a single window, and wherein the generated tutorial application is self-contained.”. Claim 1. Support for this amendment is found on page 8, lines 22 – 30 and page 9, line 8 of originally filed specification of the application.

According to Hennum at col. 3, line 12 - 16, “[p]resentation ...can include displaying multiple windows on a screen of the computer system, the explanatory information being displayed in one window and the output ... being displayed in another window.” To this extent, separate windows on a screen are presented for displaying different information. The claimed feature displays different windows “...integrated as separate segments within a single window”, claim 1. With the integration of the different windows as segments in a single window, the claimed invention presents a self-contained tutorial application without a user needing to refer to further documentation. In contrast to the claimed invention, Hennum at col. 3, lines 36 – 38 provides that “[a]ccess to the source code ...by an editing utility [to be] launched when a user selects a visually indicated jump...”. Since a user is required to activate separate applications, e.g., launching an editing utility, to refer to further documentation, Hennum teaches away from a self-contained tutorial application. As such, Hennum does not anticipate the claimed feature. Furthermore, a person of ordinary skill following Hennum’s disclosure would not achieve the claimed result because Hennum leads away from the “...self-contained generated tutorial application”, claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Office withdraw the rejection under §102(b) and §103(a).

In the same vein, similar amendments have been made to independent claim 7 and claims 14 – 15. Applicant reiterates the foregoing arguments with respect to independent claim 7, and also to dependent claims 13 – 15 and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §102(b) and §103(a).

In addition to the above, Applicant submits that all other claims dependent from independent claims 1 and 7 are allowable for the reasons stated above as well as for their unique features. These features and the appropriateness of the Office’s combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

IV. Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/John A. Merecki/
John A. Merecki
Reg. No. 35,812

Dated: August 15, 2007

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile
JAM/tc